

REMARKS

Applicant has reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on September 12, 2002, and the documents cited therewith.

Claim 1 is amended. Claims 1-34 are pending in this application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all claims in view of the amendments above and the remarks that follow.

35 USC 102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 11 were rejected under 35 USC section 102(b) as being anticipated by Bellman, Jr. et al. (U.S. 4,831,438).

Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. *In re Dillon* 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ 2d 1897, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en banc), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991). It is not enough, however, that the prior art reference discloses all the claimed elements in isolation. Rather, “[a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim.*” *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)) (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Bellman because Bellman does not teach each and every claim element arranged as in the claim. Claim 1 recites: “the at least one aircraft component is a sound source” and “the audio output indicates operation of the at least one aircraft component.” In contrast, Bellman recites that its “invention is a ‘tethered remote’ surveillance system.” *Bellman abstract*. Further, Bellman is for “monitoring an area” (*Bellman at column 14, lines 30-31*), is for understanding “activity inside the aircraft” (*Bellman at column 7, lines 50-52*) and “is advantageous in some security applications.” *Bellman at column 13, lines 56-57*.

Monitoring an area for activity to provide security does not teach or suggest providing audio output that indicates operation of an aircraft component. Thus, since Bellman is a surveillance system that monitors an area for activity in a security application, Bellman does not teach or suggest that "the audio output indicates operation of the at least one aircraft component" where "the at least one aircraft component is a sound source" as recited in claim 1.

Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, and 11 are dependent on claim 1 and are patentable over Bellman for the reasons argued above, plus the elements in the claims.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 9 and 10 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 2, 3, 6, 9 and 10 are dependent on claim 1 and are patentable over Bellman for the reasons argued above, plus the elements in the claims.

Allowed Subject Matter

Claims 12-34 were allowed.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney, (612) 371-2103, to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743 .

Respectfully submitted,

VICTOR ANDREW RILEY

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 371-2103

Date 12/12/2002

By Owen J. Gamon
Owen J. Gamon
Reg. No. 36,143

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on this 12th day of December, 2002.

Anne M. Richards

Name

Anne M. Richards

Signature